

DEC 18 2006

PATENT APPLICATION

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10007667-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Simpson et al.

Confirmation No.: 5616

Application No.: 09/874,191

Examiner: Wesley J. Tucker

Filing Date: 06/04/01

Group Art Unit: 2632

Title: System and Method for Transferring Scanned Imaging Data to a Personal Imaging Repository

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEFTransmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 10/24/06.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month
\$120☐ 2nd Month
\$450☐ 3rd Month
\$1020☐ 4th Month
\$1560☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$ 500. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

☒ A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.

Date of facsimile: 12/18/06

Typed Name: Doreen Zabinski

Signature: Doreen Zabinski

Respectfully submitted.

Simpson et al.

By Peter Kraguljac

Peter Kraguljac

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No.: 38,520

Date: 12/18/06

Telephone: (216) 348-5843

Rev 10/05a (ApBrief)

DEC 18 2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10007667-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Simpson et al.

Confirmation No.: 5816

Application No.: 09/874,191

Examiner: Wesley J. Tucker

Filing Date: 06/04/01

Group Art Unit: 2632

Title: System and Method for Transferring Scanned Imaging Data to a Personal Imaging Repository

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEFTransmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 10/24/06.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month
\$120

☐ 2nd Month
\$450

☐ 3rd Month
\$1020

☐ 4th Month
\$1590

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$ 500 . At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

☒ A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.

Date of facsimile: 12/18/06

Typed Name: Doreen Zabinaki

Signature: Doreen Zabinaki

Respectfully submitted,

Simpson et al.

By Petar Kraguljac

Petar Kraguljac

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. : 38,520

Date : 12/18/06

Telephone : (216) 348-5843

DEC 18 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:)	Examiner: Wesley J. Tucker
Simpson et al.)	
)	Art Unit: 2632
Serial No.: 09/874,191)	
)	
Filed: June 4, 2001)	
)	
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR)	
TRANSFERRING SCANNED IMAGING)	
DATA TO A PERSONAL IMAGING)	
REPOSITORY)	
)	
Date of Final Office Action:)	Attorney Docket No.:
August 24, 2006)	10007667-1
)	
Notice of Appeal Filed:)	
October 24, 2006)	
)	
December 18, 2006		

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is timely provided to support the Notice of Appeal filed October 24, 2006.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

Date of Deposit: December 18, 2006

I hereby certify that these papers are being transmitted to The Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number
(571) 273-8300 on December 18, 2006.

Doreen Zabinski
Doreen Zabinski

12/19/2006 NNGUYEN1 00000097 002025 09874191

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

1. Real Party in Interest:

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no other prior and/or pending appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings that are related to, directly affect, or that will be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

3. Status of Claims

Claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-23 are pending for examination.

Claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-13 stand rejected in the application.

Claims 11 and 20 were canceled in the application.

The rejections of claims 1-10, 12-10, 21-23 are appealed.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

4. Status of Amendments

No Amendments were filed subsequent to the Final Office Action.

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 18 2006

5. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Broadly stated, the present invention is directed to an improved system and method for transferring scanned imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository. (Specification, page 8, lines 9-10).

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 is directed to a system for transferring scanned imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository. (See, Fig. 1). Claim 1 recites a scanning device capable of scanning imaging data. (Specification, page 3, lines 12-13). Claim 1 further recites the scanning device configured to obtain user information relating to a personal imaging repository associated with a particular user for storing imaging data that is to be accessed by remote web services. (Specification, page 10, lines 11-13, page 10, lines 22-24).

Claim 1 also recites a device firmware being part of the scanning device for storing scanned imaging data from the scanning device into said personal imaging repository, and being configured to store a link reference to the scanned imaging data in a centralized data store associated to the particular user. (Specification, page 12, lines 18-20, page 13, lines 20-21, page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 4, and, page 3, lines 17-18). Claim 1 further recites that the personal imaging repository is an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data and the remote web services on the Internet by allowing the remote web services to locate imaging data associated with the particular user by accessing the centralized data store. (Specification, page 10, line 22 – page 11, line 2).

Independent Claim 12

Independent claim 12 is directed to a method for transferring scanned imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository having one or more imaging data stores for storing the imaging data of a user and a composition store for storing imaging compositions having links to the imaging data. (See, Specification, Fig. 3). Claim 12 recites receiving the scanned imaging data. (Specification, page 12, line 27-page 13, line 2). Claim 12 further recites obtaining, by the scanning device, user information relating to the personal imaging repository

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

that identifies an imaging data store and a composition store associated to the user. (Specification, page 13, lines 2-11).

Claim 12 also recites connecting, by the scanning device, with the imaging data store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information. (Specification, page 13, lines 12-17). Claim 12 further recites transferring, by the scanning device, the scanned imaging data to the imaging data store. (Specification, page 13, lines 16-20). Claim 12 recites storing by the scanning device, in the composition store associated to the user, a link reference that identifies a location of the scanned imaging data where the composition store maintains a plurality of link references to a plurality of imaging data that may be stored in separate imaging data stores. (Specification, Fig. 3, reference designators 130, 132, page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 4, and, page 9, lines 12-16).

Independent Claim 21

Independent claim 21 is directed to a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium that when installed in a scanning device linked to a personal imaging repository with an imaging data store for storing the imaging data and a composition store for storing imaging compositions with links to the imaging data. (See, Specification, Fig. 3, page 9, lines 3-5). Claim 21 recites the product causes the scanning device to receive scanned imaging data. (Specification, page 12, line 27- page 13, line 2).

Claim 21 also recites the product causes the scanning device to obtain user information relating to the personal imaging repository (Specification, page 13, lines 2-11), and causes the scanning device to connect with the imaging data store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information. (Specification, page 13, lines 12-17).

Claim 21 also recites the product causes the scanning device to transfer the scanned imaging data to the imaging data store, (Specification, page 13, lines 16-20), and to transfer a link to a composition store associated with the user, the composition store being configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data associated with the user that may be stored in

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

different imaging data stores on remote devices. (Specification, Fig. 3, reference designators 130, 132, page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 4, and, page 9, lines 12-16).

Independent Claim 22

Independent claim 22 is directed to a computer program product comprising readable program codes that when executed causes a scanning device to perform a method. (See, Specification, Fig. 3, page 9, lines 3-5). Claim 22 recites receiving references to a personal imaging repository of a user, the references including a data store reference that identifies an imaging data store for storing scanned image data and a composition store reference that identifies a composition store for storing link references to scanned image data associated with the user. (Specification, page 13, lines 2-4).

Claim 22 further recites transferring a scanned image data to the image data store using the data store reference. (Specification, Fig. 3, reference designator 116, page 13, lines 16-20). Claim 22 also recites obtaining a link reference to the scanned image data transferred to the image data store. (Specification, Fig. 3, reference designator 118, page 13, lines 20-24). Claim 22 additionally recites causing the link reference to be stored in a composition store identified by the composition store reference where the composition store can be accessed by a plurality of remote web services to identify locations of scanned image data associated with the user. (Specification, Fig. 3, reference designator 130, page 13, line 25-page 14, line 2, page 3, lines 13-16, and, page 4, lines 19-21).

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

6. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The following grounds of rejection are to be reviewed on appeal:

- I. Whether Claims 12-19 are unpatentable under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,115,739 to Ogawa et al.
- II. Whether Claims 1-9 and 21-23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination U.S. Patent 6,115,739 to Ogawa and U.S. Patent 6,930,709 to Creamer et al.
- III. Whether Claim 10 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the combination of Ogawa and Creamer and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,182,892 to Angelo et al.
- IV. Whether the level of ordinary skill in the art has been properly ascertained under MPEP §2141.03.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

7. Argument

I. Whether claims 12-19 are unpatentable under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,115,739 to Ogawa et al.

Claim Phrase "linked reference"

Regarding the term "linked reference", the Office Action of March 9, 2006 maintains that "it should be clear that the user IDs [of Ogawa] and their relationships of correspondence to the associated directories clearly reads on the term 'link reference'". Office Action at p. 6. The Final Office Action of August 24, 2006 further provides "[a] link reference is a file path or some kind of identifier that states where an image file can be, and that is what the Examiner has interpreted it as." Final Office Action at page 4. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that the interpretation of the phrase "link reference" set forth in the Office Action and the Final Office Action is incorrect for at least the reasons set forth below. However, even using the Office Action's definition, Ogawa's user ID fails to meet the definition. A user ID is not "a file path" and does not "state where an image file can be." One of ordinary skill in the art would not equate a user ID to a link reference. Thus, Ogawa fails to anticipate the claims for at least this reason and the rejection is not supported.

Ogawa teaches a file for associating the data items with the directories is created in a designated directory by the administration software. (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 34-36). Ogawa further teaches that a user, not the scanner, stores the user ID. Ogawa states:

"Each user of the image scanner registers his/her own ID information in a directory associative file shown in Fig. 4 in advance." (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 46-48, emphasis added).

Thus, at the point in time of image scanning, the directory associative file is static in nature: "said file server includes directories which are created in advance in one-to-one correspondence to users and in which image data read by said image scanner is stored". (Ogawa, Col. 2, lines 32-35, emphasis added).

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

The scanner of Ogawa does not store any information in the directory associative file – it is merely a consumer of information (e.g. it reads information) previously stored in the directory associative file. Based on the information previously stored in the directory associative file (e.g., user ID to directory association), the file server of Ogawa stores the image data in a directory associated with identification information input from the scanner. (See, Ogawa, Col. 2, lines 39-41).

Contrary to the statically stored associative information of Ogawa, the “link reference” of the subject application is a reference to imaging data that is obtained by the scanning device that the scanning device in turn stores to facilitate locating of the imaging data. See, present specification Fig. 3. Therefore, for example, referring to Fig. 3, at block 116, the “scanning device transfers imaging data to the imaging data store.” Thereafter, at block 118, the “scanning device obtains reference to transferred imaging data stored in the imaging data store.”

With continued reference to Figure 3 of the present specification, at block 130 the “scanning device adds link to imaging data store in imaging composition”. (Emphasis added). The corresponding portion of the detailed description provides: “[a]fter a successful connection to the composition store (block 124), the scanning device creates an imaging composition (block 128) and adds the reference to the imaging data stored in the imaging data store obtained earlier in the imaging composition (block 130)”. (Page 13, line 26 – page 14, line 2, emphasis added).

Thus, the “link reference” of the subject application is a reference to scanned imaging data obtained and stored by the scanning device. The link reference is stored in a centralized store (e.g., composition store), with the imaging data stored in an imaging data store. Accordingly, contrary to the Office Action (page 5), one of ordinary skill in the art would not equate a user ID (of Ogawa) with a link reference and further Ogawa provides no suggestion or motivation to believe otherwise.

The claim rejections will be addressed in light of this clear distinction between the UserID of Ogawa and the “link reference” of the subject application.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

Independent Claim 12

Claim 12 recites storing by the scanning device, in a composition store associated to a user, a link reference that identifies a location of the scanned imaging data where the composition store maintains a plurality of link references to a plurality of imaging data that may be stored in separate imaging data stores. Ogawa fails to teach or suggest this feature and thus claim 12 patentably distinguishes over the reference of record.

Ogawa teaches an image scanner adapted for direct connection to client/server type network. (Ogawa, Title). A file server includes directories which are created in advance in one-to-one correspondence to users. (Ogawa, Abstract). A file for associating the data items with the directories is created in a designated directory by the administration software. (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 34-36). Each user of the image scanner registers his/her own ID information in the directory associative file shown in Fig. 4 in advance. (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 46-48, emphasis added). When image data is input from the image scanner, the file server stores the image data in a directory associated with identification information input from the image scanner. (Ogawa, Abstract).

Significantly, the scanner of Ogawa does not store any information in the directory associative file as it is merely a consumer of information previously stored in the directory associative file. Further, the scanner of Ogawa does not store a link reference to imaging data – the scanner provides the imaging data to the file server which stores the imaging data in a directory. The user ID (of Ogawa) inputted by a user is not stored by the scanner. Thus, the User ID is not processed like the claimed link reference and does not function like the claimed link reference. Therefore, the claimed system recited in claim 12 is not taught or suggested by Ogawa.

Ogawa fails to teach storing by a scanning device a link reference that identifies a location of scanned imaging data as recited in claim 12. The user ID of Ogawa is not stored by the scanning device and the user ID does not identify a location of scanned imaging data. The user ID is stored by users (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 46-48) and the user ID identifies a user. Therefore, Ogawa fails to teach each and every limitation of claim 12 and fails to establish a proper §102 rejection. The rejection should be reversed.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

Since claim 12 recites features not disclosed or suggested by the reference, claim 12 patentably distinguishes over Ogawa and is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, dependent claims 13-19 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

II. Whether claims 1-9 and 21-23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination U.S. Patent 6,115,739 to Ogawa and U.S. Patent 6,930,709 to Creamer et al.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a device firmware being part of a scanning device configured to store a link reference to scanned imaging data in a centralized data store associated to a particular user. The imaging data is stored in a personal imaging repository. Ogawa and Creamer both fail to teach, suggest or make obvious this feature and thus claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references of record.

As discussed in greater detail above, the scanner of Ogawa does not store a link reference to imaging data – the scanner provides the imaging data to the file server which stores the imaging data in a directory. The scanner of Ogawa does not store any information in the directory associative file as it is a consumer of information previously stored in the directory associative file. The User ID of Ogawa is not stored by the device firmware and thus does not teach or suggest firmware in a scanning device that stores a link reference as claimed. The user IDs of Ogawa are registered by users. (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 46-48).

Creamer teaches an integrated Internet/intranet camera. (Creamer, Title). Upon capturing the digital image, the camera initiates a connection to the Internet, connects to the destination user directory, and uploads the digital images. (Creamer, Abstract). Thereafter, the digital images are available to authorized (or any) user having access to the Internet. (Creamer, Abstract). The camera of Creamer does not store a link reference to imaging data – the camera connects to the destination user directory and uploads the digital images. Thus, Creamer fails to

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

teach, suggest or make obvious firmware that stores a link reference to imaging data as recited in claim 1, and fails to cure the shortcomings of Ogawa.

Ogawa and Creamer, individually or in combination, fail to teach, suggest or make obvious the claimed scanning device including firmware for storing a link reference to imaging data in a centralized store associated to a particular user as recited in claim 1. Since claim 1 recites features not disclosed or suggested by the references, alone or in combination, the rejection is not supported and a prima facie obviousness rejection has not been established. Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references of record and is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-10 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance. The rejection should be reversed.

Independent Claim 21

Claim 21 is directed to a computer program product that when installed in a scanning device causes the scanning device to transfer a link to a composition store associated with a user, the composition store being configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data associated with the user that may be stored in different imaging data stores on remote devices. Ogawa and Creamer both fail to teach, suggest or make obvious this feature and thus claim 21 patentably distinguishes over the references of record.

The scanner of Ogawa does not store a link reference to imaging data as the scanner provides the imaging data to the file server which stores the imaging data in a directory. Further, the scanner of Ogawa does not store any information in the directory associative file as it is a consumer of information previously stored in the directory associative file. Thus, Ogawa does not teach, suggest or make obvious a scanning device that transfers a link to a composition store associated with a user, the composition store configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data. Additionally, the user ID of Ogawa is not transferred by the scanner device to a composition store. Thus, the user ID fails to teach or suggest the "link reference" limitation. The user ID of Ogawa is registered by a user in a file (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 46-48) and the scanner does not transfer it.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

The integrated Internet/intranet camera of Creamer initiates a connection to the Internet, connects to the destination user directory, and uploads the digital images. (Creamer, Abstract). Thereafter, the digital images are available to authorized (or any) user having access to the Internet. (Creamer, Abstract). The camera of Creamer does not transfer a link to a composition store associated with a user, the composition store configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data – the camera connects to the destination user directory and uploads the digital images. Thus, Creamer fails to teach, suggest or make obvious a scanning device that transfers a link to a composition store associated with a user, the composition store configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data as recited in claim 21, and fails to cure the shortcomings of Ogawa.

Ogawa and Creamer fail to teach, suggest or make obvious a scanning device that transfers a link to a composition store associated with a user, the composition store configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data as recited in claim 21. Thus, the combined references fail to support an obviousness rejection and the rejection should be reversed. Since claim 21 recites features not disclosed or suggested by the references, alone or in combination, claim 21 patentably distinguishes over the references and should now be allowed.

Independent Claim 22

Claim 22 is directed to a computer program product comprising readable program codes that when executed causes a scanning device to perform a method, the method comprising obtaining a link reference to scanned image data transferred to an image data store; and causing the link reference to be stored in a composition store identified by the composition store reference where the composition store can be accessed by a plurality of remote web services to identify locations of scanned image data associated with the user. Ogawa and Creamer both fail to teach, suggest or make obvious these features and thus claim 22 patentably distinguishes over the references of record.

The scanner of Ogawa does not obtain a link reference to scanned image data. Further, the scanner does not store a link reference to imaging data. Instead, the scanner provides imaging data to a file server that stores the imaging data in a directory based on a user ID. The user ID of Ogawa is not stored by the scanner and thus fails to teach or suggest the claimed link

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

reference. The user ID of Ogawa is registered by a user in a file (Ogawa, Col. 4, lines 46-48) and the scanner does not store it. Thus, Ogawa does not teach, suggest or make obvious a method that obtains a link reference to scanned image data and causes the link reference to be stored in a composition store.

Creamer fails to cure the shortcomings of Ogawa. As discussed above, the camera of Creamer initiates a connection to the Internet, connects to the destination user directory, and uploads the digital images. (Creamer, Abstract). Thereafter, the digital images are available to authorized (or any) user having access to the Internet. (Creamer, Abstract). The camera of Creamer does not obtain a link reference to scanned image data. Further, the camera does not store a link reference to imaging data. Thus, Creamer does not teach, suggest or make obvious a method that obtains a link reference to scanned image data and/or causes the link reference to be stored in a composition store.

Ogawa and Creamer fail to teach, suggest or make obvious a scanning device that transfers a link to a composition store associated with a user, the composition store configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data as recited in claim 22. Since claim 22 recites features not disclosed or suggested by the references, alone or in combination, claim 22 patentably distinguishes over the references of record and is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, dependent claim 23 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

III. Whether claim 10 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the combination of Ogawa and Creamer and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,182,892 to Angelo et al.

Dependent claim 10 was rejected as being obvious over the combination of Ogawa and Creamer in view of Angelo. Angelo teaches a fingerprint authentication methodology in which a smart card with a credit card form factor is used to transmit the imprint of a fingerprint to a live-scan device. (Angelo, Abstract). Angelo does not teach storing a link reference to imaging data. Thus, Angelo fails to teach, suggest or make obvious storing a link reference to imaging data as recited in claim 1 (from which claim 10 depends), and fails to cure the shortcomings of Ogawa and Creamer.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 18 2006

IV. Whether the level of ordinary skill has been properly ascertained

MPEP §2141.03 requires that Office Actions ascertain and describe the level of the hypothetical person of ordinary skill in the art so that objectivity can be maintained. Here the Office Actions neither ascertained nor reported on the level of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, all the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

The MPEP requires that the Office Action ascertain and describe the level of ordinary skill so that objectivity can be maintained. MPEP §2141.03 reads:

The importance of resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art lies in the necessity of maintaining objectivity in the obviousness inquiry. *Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 714, 718, 21 USPQ2d 1053, 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The examiner must ascertain what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and not to the inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand. *Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F.2d 693, 218 USPQ 865 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 464 U.S. 1043 (1984).

Here the Office Action neither ascertains nor reports on the level of ordinary skill in the art. The skill level has not been ascertained. For this additional reason, the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 18 2006

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, a prima facie obviousness rejection has not been established for any claim. All rejections have been shown to be improper. Appellant respectfully believes that all pending claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-23 patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and that the rejections should be withdrawn. Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Appeals overturn the Examiner's rejections and allow all pending claims. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



PETER KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843
McDonald Hopkins Co., LPA
600 Superior Avenue, E.
Suite 2100
Cleveland, OH 44114

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 18 2006

Claims Appendix

1. A system for transferring scanned imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository, comprising:

a scanning device capable of scanning imaging data;

the scanning device configured to obtain user information relating to a personal imaging repository associated with a particular user for storing imaging data that is to be accessed by remote web services; and,

a device firmware being part of the scanning device for storing scanned imaging data from the scanning device into said personal imaging repository, and being configured to store a link reference to the scanned imaging data in a centralized data store associated to the particular user;

wherein said personal imaging repository is an exchange infrastructure between the imaging data and the remote web services on the Internet by allowing the remote web services to locate imaging data associated with the particular user by accessing the centralized data store.

2. The system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository stores the imaging data in a plurality of file formats.

3. The system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository comprises an imaging data store assigned to the user for storing imaging data.

4. The system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository comprises a plurality of imaging data stores for storing imaging data.

5. The system as defined in claim 4 wherein one of said plurality of imaging data stores is assigned to the user for storing imaging data.

6. The system as defined in claim 4 wherein one of said plurality of imaging data stores is assigned to a web service for storing imaging data provided by the web service.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

7. The system as defined in claim 1 wherein the centralized data store comprises a composition store for storing imaging compositions of the imaging data.

8. The system as defined in claim 7 wherein said imaging composition comprises a link reference for each imaging data.

9. The system as defined in claim 1 wherein said personal imaging repository is located on another data storage device that is linked to an imaging client.

10. The system as defined in claim 1 wherein said scanning device being configured to obtain user information from smart card.

11. (Canceled)

12. A method for transferring scanned imaging data from a scanning device to a personal imaging repository having one or more imaging data stores for storing the imaging data of a user and a composition store for storing imaging compositions having links to the imaging data, said method comprising:

receiving the scanned imaging data;

obtaining, by the scanning device, user information relating to the personal imaging repository that identifies an imaging data store and a composition store associated to the user;

connecting, by the scanning device, with the imaging data store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information;

transferring, by the scanning device, the scanned imaging data to the imaging data store;
and

storing by the scanning device, in the composition store associated to the user, a link reference that identifies a location of the scanned imaging data where the composition store maintains a plurality of link references to a plurality of imaging data that may be stored in separate imaging data stores.

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

13. The method according to claim 12 further comprising the steps of:
obtaining the link reference of the scanned imaging data stored in the imaging data store;
and,
disconnecting from the imaging data store by the scanning device.

14. The method according to claim 12 wherein said step of connecting with the imaging data store further comprising the steps of:
determining whether the connection with the imaging data store is successful;
returning an error message to the user when the connection is not successful; and,
converting the scanned imaging data into a predefined format.

15. The method according to claim 14 wherein said predefined format is any one from the group consisting of:

Joint Photographic Experts Group Format;
Graphics Interchange Format;
Portable Network Graphics Format;
Tagged Image File Format;
Portable Document Format; and,
Microsoft Windows bitmap format.

16. The method according to claim 12 where the storing comprising the steps of:
obtaining the link reference of the scanned imaging data stored in the imaging data store;
connecting with the composition store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information;
creating an imaging composition having the link reference to the scanned imaging data stored in the imaging data store; and,
saving the imaging composition to the composition store.

17. The method according to claim 16 further comprising the steps of:
setting the imaging composition as a selected composition available for service in the composition store; and,
disconnecting from the composition store of the personal imaging repository.

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

18. The method according to claim 16 wherein prior to the step of creating an imaging composition further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the connection with the composition store is successful; and,
returning an error message to the user when the connection to the composition is not successful.

19. The method according to claim 16 wherein said step of creating an imaging composition further comprising the step of adding the link reference of the imaging data stored in the imaging data store to the imaging composition.

20. (Canceled).

21. A computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes embodied in the medium that when installed in a scanning device linked to a personal imaging repository with an imaging data store for storing the imaging data and a composition store for storing imaging compositions with links to the imaging data, the product causes the scanning device to:

receive scanned imaging data;
obtain user information relating to the personal imaging repository;
connect with the imaging data store of the personal imaging repository indicated from the user information;
transfer the scanned imaging data to the imaging data store; and
transfer a link to a composition store associated with the user, the composition store being configured to contain link references to a plurality of image data associated with the user that may be stored in different imaging data stores on remote devices.

22. A computer program product comprising readable program codes that when executed causes a scanning device to perform a method, the method comprising:

receiving references to a personal imaging repository of a user, the references including a data store reference that identifies an imaging data store for storing scanned image data and a

Docket No10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

composition store reference that identifies a composition store for storing link references to scanned image data associated with the user;

transferring a scanned image data to the image data store using the data store reference;

obtaining a link reference to the scanned image data transferred to the image data store;

and

causing the link reference to be stored in a composition store identified by the composition store reference where the composition store can be accessed by a plurality of remote web services to identify locations of scanned image data associated with the user.

23. The computer program product of claim 22 where the locations of the scanned image data can include multiple remote locations.

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

Evidence Appendix

There is no extrinsic evidence.

Docket No 10007667-1
Appl. No. 09/874,191
Appeal Brief dated December 18, 2006

Related Proceedings Appendix

There are no related proceedings.